

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program Implementation Grant, Round 2, 2013*

---

|                       |                            |                            |               |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Applicant</b>      | Solano County Water Agency | <b>Amount Requested</b>    | \$ 9,579,578  |
| <b>Proposal Title</b> | Westside IRWM              | <b>Total Proposal Cost</b> | \$ 24,661,902 |

---

#### PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposal consists of eight projects: (1) Abandoned Well Incentive Program; (2) Woodland-Davis Clean Water Agency (WDCWA) Portion of the Sacramento River Joint Intake Project; (3) Dixon Main Drain/V-Drain Enlargement Project; (4) Lower Putah Creek Main Channel Restoration: Monticello Dam to Dry Creek; (5) Middle Creek Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration Project; (6) Regional Collaborative Water Use Efficiency Program; (7) Wastewater Storage Ponds and Disposal Improvements; and (8) Water Tank Replacement Project.

#### PROPOSAL SCORE

| Criteria  | Score/<br>Max. Possible | Criteria                   | Score/<br>Max. Possible |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Work Plan   | 6/15                    | Technical Justification    | 6/10                    |
| Budget  | 2/5                     |                            |                         |
| Schedule  | 3/5                     | Benefits and Cost Analysis | 15/30                   |
| Monitoring, Assessment, and<br>Performance Measures | 4/5                     | Program Preferences        | 7/10                    |
| Total Score (max. possible = 80)                    |                         |                            | 43                      |

#### EVALUATION SUMMARY

##### WORK PLAN

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The work plan identifies which goals and objectives in the Westside IRWM Plan will be addressed by the proposed projects and describes how the proposed projects will meet IRWM Plan goals, objectives, and focus areas. A tabulated overview of the projects is included that provides a general description and an evaluation of the readiness to proceed, and several detailed maps are attached. The description provided in the table is lacking detail and information on individual project logistics. A scope of work is provided for each project, but no tasks are included. The work plan discusses CEQA and permitting status, but does not list the permits that will be involved with each project. The work plan does not include data management and monitoring deliverables consistent with the IRWM Plan Standards and Guidance. Projects 2 and 5 will not be able to operate as a standalone project and project 3 is phase 1 of the larger Eastside Drain Projects.

## **BUDGET**

Budgets for less than half the projects in the proposal have detailed cost information. Many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the budget categories. The budget tables for each project are broken into budget categories and some of the detail budget tables include tasks; however there is no connection to the work plan since there are no tasks listed in the work plan. Five of the eight projects have detailed cost information but lack supporting documentation. Many of the projects do not include an explanation of how costs were estimated. Project 1's budget lists a total cost share that is inconsistent with the main summary budget and a cost is not listed for construction administration, but the text discusses "construction administration tasks"; the budget also includes travel expenses, which are not permissible. The cost share for project 2 is difficult to discern in the backup documentation provided. Projects 4, 5, 7, and 8 do not include an explanation of cost estimates and back-up documentation is insufficient. Project 7 does not include the attachment referenced that should include a breakdown of construction costs associated with the Project. Project 8 is lacking the detailed construction information as well. The summary budget does not list projects in the same order as the work plan, detailed budget, and detailed schedules, which makes it difficult to keep track of project information.

## **SCHEDULE**

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The schedule and work plan are not consistent since there are no tasks listed in the work plan, and the projects are not consecutively discussed in the same order. The reasonableness of the Schedule cannot be determined because of the absence of tasks in the Work Plan. The Schedule demonstrates a readiness to begin construction of one component of the proposal by October 2013 (the WDCWA Portion of the Sacramento River Joint Intake Project); the other projects will begin construction between February 2014 and May 2014.

## **MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The identified monitoring targets are appropriate for most of the benefits claimed; however, it is unclear how the measurement tools and methods listed will effectively monitor project performance and target progress. The measurement tools and methods should have included tools and methods for water quality as part of projects 7 and 8. The applicant did not provide quantifiable targets for all projects. The information provided demonstrates that it is feasible to meet the targets of six of the eight projects within the life of the projects; some of the targets are not attainable within the life of the project. Projects 2 and 5 are components of larger projects and the targets will not be realized in the project lifetime.

## **TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION**

The proposal appears to be technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but lacks documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the projects and physical benefits are not well described. Projects 2 and 5 do not appear to be technically justified for all of the benefits claimed, as they are part of larger projects that are not covered in this proposal. Projects 2 and 5 do not clearly define the specific benefits associated with the proposed project components submitted. The applicant only provided supporting references for Projects 3 and 4. Project 8 is lacking a description of baseline values for water supply, water quality, and greenhouse gas emissions and the improved drinking water quality benefit is not technically justified.

## **BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS**

The proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. Project 2 accounts for more than half of the net present value (NPV) of project costs claimed. This project would fund screening an existing intake structure for fish protection, but benefits are based

on water supply benefits for the entire project. Even if the screening project was an indispensable part of the entire project, which is not clear, the screening portion should only be allocated a share of the project benefits. This is aside from the fact that the supply would replace groundwater that would continue to be available as a supply, making it inappropriate to claim water supply benefits outside of improved water quality.

Projects 7 and 8 together account for about 26 percent of the NPV proposal costs. The cost-effectiveness analysis approach used for filling out the B-C summary table is not appropriate for the avoided cost analysis done by the applicant (per the PSP, this analysis option is limited to projects costing less than \$350,000 or DAC projects less than \$1 million). The avoided cost analysis showed benefits exceeding costs but documentation supporting the avoided cost values was not found.

For Project 3, the structural failure probabilities don't seem to be correctly incorporated in the flood damage analysis. Projects 1 and 4 do not have monetized benefits, but have worthy non-monetized benefits. The environmental benefits documentation for project 4 is well presented. Project 5 has quantified benefits that exceed costs but the habitat benefit is not correctly monetized and it is not clear why the water cost used for calculating water supply benefits was escalated over the life of the project.

## **PROGRAM PREFERENCES**

Applicant claims no program preference and seven statewide priorities will be met with the implementation of these projects. The applicant demonstrates high degree of certainty, and adequate documentation for the seven preferences claimed: (1) Drought Preparedness; (2) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; (3) Climate Change Response Actions; (4) Expand Environmental Stewardship; (5) Practice Integrated Flood Management; (6) Protect Surface Water and Ground Water Quality; and (7) Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.